

"AESTHETIC AND MORAL IN RUSSIAN ROMANTICISM OF THE 19TH CENTURY

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7468502>

F.I. Abdurakhmanov

(UzSUWL)

H.O. Mukhitdinova

(NamSU Master's student)



ELSEVIER



Abstract: Russian writers reveal the problem of Romanticism in the works of Russian writers not only as following the traditions of the first Russian Romantics, but also as a literary reflection of the Western European literary experience.

Keywords: Romanticism, literary direction, traditions and innovation, V.A. Zhukovsky, V.G. Belinsky, "southern poems" by A.S. Pushkin, genre forms...

About: FARS Publishers has been established with the aim of spreading quality scientific information to the research community throughout the universe. Open Access process eliminates the barriers associated with the older publication models, thus matching up with the rapidity of the twenty-first century.

Received: 19-12-2022

Accepted: 20-12-2022

Published: 22-12-2022



A lot of research has been devoted to the problem of Pushkin's romanticism in modern literary science (D. Blagogo, G. Gukovsky, Yu. Lotman, N. Skatov, etc.). However, in these works, the problem of romanticism in the works of A.S. Pushkin is considered mainly as a tribute to traditions, the consequences of apprenticeship with V.A. Zhukovsky, as well as as the initial period of the formation of A.S. Pushkin's creativity.

Russian Romanticism is a consequence of the awakened national and social consciousness of the human personality. The French bourgeois revolution of 1789-1794, the crisis of the autocratic-serf system in Russia, the Patriotic War in Russia of 1812, as well as the growth of national consciousness associated with the Decembrist movement in Russia served as the impetus for the emergence of a romantic worldview.

Romanticism was a trend of the time. There was an anxious, impetuous breath of modernity in it – the era of political upheavals and thunderstorms.

The problem of Romanticism in literary coverage was revealed in the works of V. Belinsky before the research in modern literary studies. Much has been said about romanticism, and much has been argued about it. At the same time, almost all the speakers and debaters noted the lack of clarity, the "blurring" of the very concept of "romanticism". In 1843, Belinsky wrote in articles about Pushkin: "... the question has not been clarified, and romanticism has remained a mysterious and mysterious subject" [1, 1, 123].

A decade and a half after Belinsky, Apollon Grigoriev writes about the same thing: "And what to call romanticism, we still can hardly give ourselves a clear and final account. Zhukovsky's poetry is romanticism. Hugo is a romantic. Polezhaev and Marlinsky are romantics. Polevoy and Motalov's Hamlet is also a romantic. Isn't Koltsov a romantic? And isn't Lermontov a romantic in "Arbenin" and "Mtsyri"? All this is romanticism, and all this is very different ..." [4, 12].

Already in the late 20s of the XX century, Gorky complained: "There are several formulas of Romanticism, but there is no exact, completely exhaustive formula with which all literary historians would agree, it has not yet been worked out" [3, 12].

In the 1960s, a discussion about romanticism unfolded on the pages of the magazine "Questions of Literature", and the same complaints about the uncertainty of the concept of "romanticism" were heard in articles by various authors. So, A. Gurevich writes: "We still cannot, in fact, answer the main questions: what is romanticism, what are its most important features and signs, what range of historical and literary phenomena should be covered by this term" [5, 68].

V.G. Belinsky, who proclaimed romanticism a "mysterious and mysterious subject" [1,1,3], did a lot to unravel the mysteries of Romanticism, explained to us, in particular, the meaning and significance of the romantic poetry of Zhukovsky, as well as other poets belonging to the romantic direction.

Gorky, who complained about the lack of a universal formula of Romanticism, expressed many deep ideas about Romanticism and thereby contributed to its better understanding. The discussion about Romanticism, conducted by the magazine "Questions of Literature, did not and could not lead to an absolutely unanimous opinion about Romanticism, but it helped to better see the complexity of the romantic direction and art, and its great historical significance, and at the same time clarify the answers to many private questions and problems associated with Romanticism.

And in the question of Romanticism, we cannot decide anything definitively – because we are dealing with a historical phenomenon that is obviously not solved, not reduced to uniform, or even to unambiguous solutions. But we can and should try to clarify this issue as much as possible, clarify the complexity and dialectic of the issue. The only possible way to such clarification can only be a concrete historical consideration of the problem.

As A. N. Sokolov noted in his article "On Disputes about Romanticism", "an indisputable and relatively clear scientific task is the historical and literary study of the romantic trend, as it developed in a certain national literature in a certain historical period" [6, 123].

For the first time, the word "romanticism" as a term, as the name of an entire literary trend, began to be used at the end of the XVIII century in Germany. In the

same place, the school of "Jena romantics" – the brothers Schlegel, Novalis, Tick, Wakkenroder, etc. – created the first, quite thorough (although not unified and far from integral) theory of Romanticism. The theory and practice of German Romanticism had one or another influence on French Romanticism, English Romanticism, and Russian Romanticism – on all currents of European Romanticism, which were widely spread and developed at the beginning of the XIX century.

The antithesis "dream – reality" becomes constructive among Romantics, it organizes the artistic world of the romantic, becomes for him at the same time the most important ideological, the most important aesthetic principle.

Psychological laws, like the law of imitation and the law of antithesis, determine the very possibility of a particular movement of culture, art, literature. But the direction of this movement, what kind of law – imitation or repulsion – will act in this historically concrete case, is determined by the reasons of a social, social nature. Romantic denial was generated not by the psychology of certain writers, even if they were great, even brilliant, not by their individual will and even more so by self – will, but above all by social conditions, circumstances of historical, social life. In the conditions of public life, we must look for the deep origins of the emergence of the romantic trend in literature and art.

The romantics treated history freely and poetically, and they worshipped in pei the same thing they worshipped in a fairy tale. In history, they were looking not for the past, but for a dream, not for what was, but for what they wanted. In their works of art, they depicted the historical fact as much as they constructed it in accordance with their social and aesthetic ideals.

Romantics willingly turned to those genres that originate from folk poetry or are somehow close to it: fairy tales, songs, ballads, etc.

In romantic art, it was not poetic laws that were most valued, but free poetic individuality. Not coincidentally, as N. Ya. Berkovsky rightly noted, "lyrics were the genre that in the practice of romantics subordinated all other genres. The novel has become lyrical, the drama has become lyrical" [2, 12].

Due to the predominance of a free lyrical beginning in romantic poetry, there is also a predilection of many romantics for fragmentary compositions. A fragment is a kind of lyric, and genuine lyrics always gravitate towards a fragment. At the same time, the fragment is a fundamentally free poetic form. F. Schlegel called Arabesques, combined with confession (i.e. with lyrical recognition), "the only romantic creations of our era." "A fragment," he argued, "is the most truthful way of artistic expression. The artist is naturally fragmentary" [7, 49].

Romanticism in Russia did not develop autonomously, not in isolation. He was in close interaction with European Romanticism, although he did not repeat it, and even more so did not copy it,

Russian Romanticism was a part of pan-European Romanticism and as such could not but take into itself some of its essential generic properties and signs generated by the tragic perception of the consequences of the French bourgeois revolution: for example, distrust of rational concepts, strong interest in direct feeling, repulsion from all kinds of "systematization", etc.

Russian romantic consciousness and Russian romantic art thus shared the common experience of European Romanticism in the process of the formation of Russian romantic consciousness and Russian romantic art.

However, for the appearance of Romanticism in Russia, in addition to general reasons, there were also reasons of their own, internal, ultimately, and caused specific forms of Russian Romanticism to have a special and unique appearance.

Russian Romanticism knows at least two stages in its development, two waves of its ascent. The first wave was caused by the events of 1812 and the consequences of these events. It gave rise to the romantic poetry of Zhukovsky and the romantic creativity of Pushkin.

The second romantic wave in Russia comes after the catastrophe of 1825, after the defeat of the December uprising of 1825.

It has already been noted that Russian Romanticism as a whole is markedly different from European Romanticism, although it is associated with it. These main, most significant differences of Russian Romanticism are mainly reduced to two points: the relation to mysticism and the mystical in art and the role of the individual, personal principle in it. Elements of the mystical occupy an important place in the poetics of European, especially German, Romanticism.

German Romanticism could attract Russian romantics from time to time to the mystery, a craving for depth, but not by its mysticism and predilection for the extraordinary. In Russian Romanticism, unlike German, mysticism, as a rule, was absent. This is true not only in relation to the romantic poetry of Pushkin and Lermontov and the work of the Decembrist poets, but also in relation to Tyutchev, to V. Odoevsky. Russian romantics not only avoided mysticism, but treated it with hostility.

Undoubtedly, in their poetry and in their aesthetic theory, the Russian Romantics were more "realists" than the German (and European in general), and they were also great rationalists. Russian Romanticism, unlike Western Romanticism, has never opposed itself to enlightenment and enlightenment philosophy based on absolute trust in reason.

In this sense, Romanticism in Russia was, as it were, not quite, not completely romanticism. This explains the repulsion of the Russian Romantics from the mystical, and the unbroken connection of many of them with the poetics of classicism.

Romantic ideas about personality and unlimited freedom of creative will brought to life that theory of "romantic irony", which Russian Romanticism, little individualistic, passed by Fichte, not only never used, but even seemed not to notice at all. Irony for romantics is the absolute domination of the poet over the artistic material, over life and history, the triumph of the creative personality over what seems inevitable. Irony is a kind of "jumping" over oneself, an affirmation of artistic freedom and creative power.

With the help of irony, the poet, by a unique act of liberation, overthrows the power of the real. A vivid example of the embodiment of romantic irony in the literary practice of romantics are some of the dramatic works of Tick. In "Bluebeard" or "The Cat in Boots", Tick not only parodies fashionable dramatic plots, but also "plays" the viewer (reader) in a special way, who innocently believed in an artistic illusion and took seriously the free fiction of the author. The tick simultaneously creates an illusion and arbitrarily destroys it, thereby asserting the creative will that "can do anything".

The extreme individualism of Western (primarily German) Romantics and the "romantic irony" generated by this individualism turned out to be alien to Russian Romantics in general. Another peculiarity of German Romanticism was alien to them, connected with the sharply expressed individual principle in it – the apology of sensuality.

There have been and still are disputes in science about the typological scheme of Russian Romanticism for a long time. Thus, the division of romantics into two main currents is widely used: active, revolutionary romantics, and passive romantics.

True in its core, this division is also accepted in school teaching. However, at present, most scientists are not satisfied with this classification, since it is too general and cannot be considered sufficient with any in-depth study of the issue.

In literary studies, the following main varieties of Russian Romanticism are usually considered, which determined its characteristic features and main achievements:

- 1) Jukovsky's Romanticism, which is most characteristic of the early stage of Russian Romanticism and which is conventionally defined as contemplative.
- 2) The civil, revolutionary romanticism of the Decembrists and, first of all, its most prominent representative, Ryleev.
- 3) Pushkin's romanticism, which has a synthetic character, is close to the poetry of Jukovsky's and the poetry of the Decembrists and includes, moreover, something of its own, special, uniquely high.
- 4) Synthetic, but in a different way, the traditions of Decembrist, Pushkin, philosophical romanticism, and rebellious romanticism of the Byron type were reflected in the form of Lermontov romanticism.

5) 5) Philosophical romanticism, which is considered on the basis of the poetry of Venevitinov and Tyutchev.

LITERATURE

1. Belinsky V.G. Critical articles. In 3 volumes. – M.: Progress, 2013
2. Berkovsky N. Ya. Russian Romanticism - Moscow: Planeta, 2011
3. Gorky M. Sobr. Op. in 10 vols. – M.: Fiction. 2001
4. Grigoriev A. Essays and letters – M. : Planeta, 2004
5. Gurevich A. Literary Criticism - Moscow: Dar, 2012
6. Sokolov A. N. On disputes about romanticism – M.: Enlightenment, 2001
7. Schlegel F. Problems of Russian and Western European Romanticism – Moscow: Mir Knigi, 2013